



Board Caucus Meeting

Tuesday, January 31, 2023, 10:00 am

This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

Meeting Minutes

CAUCUS ATTENDEES

Chair David Postman
Member Ollie Garrett
Member Jim Vollendroff
Dustin Dickson, Executive Assistant

GUESTS

Marc Webster, Director of Legislative Relations
Toni Hood, Deputy Director
Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager
Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator
Cassidy West, Policy and Rules Coordinator
Daniel Jacobs, Policy and Rules Coordinator
Rick Garza, Agency Director
Becky Smith, Licensing and Regulation Director
Kaitlin Bamba, Deputy Director of Operations

At 10:00 am, Dustin Dickson announced that the meeting lobbies were open, and the recording had begun.

At 10:00 am, Chair Postman convened the meeting.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Marc Webster, Director of Legislative Relations

Marc Webster: Good morning. Chair Postman Board Member Garrett. Marc Webster, the Legislative Director. It is somehow the fourth week of Session already. It simultaneously feels like it's been about 45 minutes and also six months.

Chair Postman: That is the magic of the Legislature.

Marc Webster: Yeah, exactly. And just as a reminder, the very first cut-off comes on February 17th. That is the day that bills have to pass the Policy Committee, and then the fiscal cut-off where they have to pass the Fiscal Committees is about a week after that, and then we will essentially start over in the other house. Our Agency Request Bills have all been heard and are on the Executive Calendar today in the Senate. I don't know that they are all going to actually get Exec'd out. I think there is still some work to be done on the THC Bill. I think we are going to see a number of amendments or proposed amendments there, and we will try to work through those. Again, just trying to keep the focus where it should be on that

overarching policy goal and trying to stay out of the kind of arcane chemistry arguments that come to the floor with that particular bill.

The Social Equity Bill, Senate Bill 5080, was heard first, and thus, I think it's just had the most time for amendments and discussion. Senator Saldaña's staff and stakeholders have made some changes. We have seen a couple of drafts. But I think the bill is in a very good place right now. Criteria for the DIAs with the disproportionately impacted areas have been revised in the bill, as an example. And so it is scheduled for Exec this morning, and we will see if that one is ready to go. I should say that the work on the DIA Maps has led to a slight change in the maps for the first round of Social Equity Licensing. And that is, I think, something that Becky will be speaking to later in the agenda. Our Subpoena Authority Bill 5405 also had its initial hearing yesterday, I haven't heard of amendments on that except for one comma being added to remove some slight ambiguity in the underlying law. One of those great ambiguous commas.

As I said, I think we are going to see a number of amendments proposed on the THC Bill with many including the hemp industry, feeling that the milligram threshold for regulation by the LCB is too low and many in the 502 industry are feeling that it is too high. Chandra is testifying this afternoon on a bill that would clarify the ability of our enforcement officers to be trained at the State's Law Enforcement Academy. And the Bill just adds limited jurisdiction peace officers to the laws requiring training approved by the Criminal Justice Training Commission. Kind of an "in the weeds bill" but something that is important to our Enforcement and Education Division.

We have been supportive of bills this year aimed at improving the medical cannabis space such as House Bill 1453, which removes the excise tax for registered medical patients. This can be like an incentive to get people registered, helping demonstrate demand for medical cannabis to incent producers in turn to produce more of it.

Something I know that the Board has been interested in, we have been opposed on a bill to make permanent the temporary allowances allowing for the delivery of alcohol from restaurants and bars largely using third-party delivery services. We have been engaged with the prime sponsor in the House with stakeholders both pro and con, kind of working through some of the elements of the bill. And we have been working with the Governor's office to urge caution on this policy, partly I think as a result of the compliance rates that we observed during the time that temporary privileges had been active. And just as a reminder, they are set to sunset on July 1 of this year. There are a lot of cannabis bills this year, including two different proposals to change the excise tax, instituting a tiered tax based on potency, another attempt to create the cannabis commission and a bill that would force local governments that have bans or moratoria on cannabis sales to put those policies on the ballot in order to keep them. That is what I've got for you thus far. We will keep working on it, and I hope to be able to share more with you in the coming weeks.

Chair Postman: Thanks, Marc. A couple of quick questions. On 1453, the delivery, you mentioned the Governor's office. The Governor opposes the Bill, supports the position that we have put forward. Right? This is something that the administration has taken the lead on.

Marc Webster: Yeah. This is a House Bill 1375, and 1453 is the medical cannabis one, but this is 1375.

Chair Postman: Excise tax. Sorry.

Marc Webster: Right.

Marc Webster: Yes. And the Senate version of that is being heard this week on Thursday. And we will be there this time with the Governor's office explaining that position.

Chair Postman: And on the tax on high potency, is there like a public health and prevention version of that as well as an industry version of that?

Marc Webster: Yes. There are two different bills, one, much more from the public health side. That one is sponsored by Representative Davis. The other one lowers the excise tax on lower potency cannabis.

Chair Postman: I know it's not our back necessarily, but any chance that might coalesce into some consensus where both public health and prevention in the industry agree on a tax bill?

Marc Webster: They are pretty far apart right now, but I suppose that -- I mean, we do have time. It's a long session. That could happen. I think for something like that to happen, it might take more than one session. That is a really interesting idea. Okay. Thanks.

Chair Postman: Ollie, any questions for Marc? One last one on the THC Bill. And I know it is early in this but given that we are sort of in the middle, so to speak.

Marc Webster: Right.

Chair Postman: We got some people saying go to zero, and some people say go to 4.5 or whatever, go higher.

Marc Webster: To go higher than 5, yeah.

Chair Postman: Yeah. What do we think is going to be happening here? How are we going to be any chance that will be a sit-down conversation with people about negotiating a bill?

Marc Webster: Absolutely. I mean, I've talked with Senator Robinson this morning about sitting down and talking about that very issue.

Chair Postman: Yeah.

Marc Webster: So I think that is exactly where a lot of those discussions are going to center. And I think we knew that even before session began. Once you have the number up there.

Chair Postman: Yeah, we really need that bill though.

Marc Webster: Yep.

Chair Postman: That's great. Okay. Thank you. Good luck.

Marc Webster: Thank you.

Chair Postman: We will see you soon. Our next update is about our System Modernization Project. That is the big computer system known as SMP. And Deputy Director Toni Hood is here to give us an update. Good morning.

SYSTEM MODERNIZATION PROJECT (SMP) UPDATE

Toni Hood, Deputy Director

Toni Hood: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Postman, Member Garrett. I just have a short update about System Modernization. On the weekend of February 10th through the 12th, our team will be transitioning our document storage and our access platform to Laserfiche. They will spend the whole weekend moving over the active data, and they will roll out the interim solution that will start Monday, February 13th, in the morning. And the reason I'm here today is to let you and members of the public know that applications may process a little slower as we transition into that interim process and as our staff learn the new technology and the workflow,

The good news, our staff started training today. We do just-in-time training, so we intentionally started it now. And we will train for the next few weeks so that it's fresh in staffs' mind on how to use the interim solution. And we will use this interim solution until Salesforce is fully in place. And Salesforce is the bigger part of the System Modernization Project, and it will not be fully in place until April or May of 2024. So we need this interim solution for a little over a year while we continue to work with Salesforce. We are very confident that over the weekend we will be able to move the data and transition. We had a great dry run last week. Big thank you to Glenda Shafer who ran the dry run. It's all very specific and set out and structured as to who does what and when you have authority to do what. So I was very happy to listen to part of that dry run, and then they will do the real thing starting February 10th after work.

And if for some reason the transition doesn't go as we planned, we have the option to roll back to the current status if we need to. And so we will be in communication all weekend and, hopefully, we won't have to discuss a rollback. But we could do that rollback. This is an important step in finally getting into the new modern system with Salesforce as the foundation of the solution. So, if you have any questions, let me know. But I just wanted you and the public to know that we will have that potential slight slowdown on February 13th.

Chair Postman: Great. I sat in on the town hall meeting you had last week. I don't know. It seemed almost every single employee was on there.

Toni Hood: We had a great turnout. I was very happy to see I saw 248 at one point, but I don't know if I saw the final number. But yes, 248.

Chair Postman: So it's great. And I will say people who are going to rely on this system and are the people you're going to be training and all that, which are not me necessarily, so a lot of it was over my head. I just wonder what the takeaway was of the team from the kind of questions you were getting. I mean, are people ready for this?

Toni Hood: I think they are. I think that they are ready to do their training, which started today. I think the town hall came at the right time and giving them that preview. And I thought the video was done well by Jodie. And of course, people could go back and watch that video. That is just one of the many, many tools they have. So after they are trained this week and next week, if they want to go back and watch that, again, it can help cement the process. And so I think the questions that we got in the chat that day were what we expected from the users.

Chair Postman: Good. Yeah. Since we are at this point where SMP largely has been this big thing, and it's about to get really personal. Right?

Toni Hood: It is.

Chair Postman: It's going to be what people are doing at their desk, and we need to sort of go from the SMP team to everybody to try to get us over this next little hump here.

Toni Hood: Yes, we do. And we will have a lot of office hours available. Our training team will be available after the 13th so that there will be lots of time for people to come and say, I know I was trained, but I need a refresher, or I need more information on this specific tool. So we want to make sure that they feel comfortable knowing that they have lots of support for the two weeks after the 13th and, of course, thereafter.

RULES TEAM UPDATES

Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager

Kathy Hoffman: Good morning, Chair Postman, and Board Member Garrett. I'm going to start with a brief Rules Update for February since we are not having a Board Meeting tomorrow. So we will set the date for the month of February, and then I'll hand it over to Jeff to walk through the semantic analysis that was conducted with respect to the Canopy Rules work on the Cannabis side. So beginning with the Alcohol Rules in Progress, I just want to let everybody know we are going to pause our work on private club membership drives for now. That was consistent with the rule petition that the Board approved on September 14th. We are likely to resume that in mid to late summer because we want to prioritize the work around Class 13 Alcohol Server Privilege Review. And that was the position that we received last November that the Board approved on January 4th.

So Daniel will be moving that project along with hopes to bring a CR 101 to you around mid-March. That would put the CR 102 mid-June and gives a lot of time for stakeholder engagement there. And then that would probably bring the Final Rule adoption somewhere early August, so looking forward to bringing that forward to the Board within that time frame.

And then moving on to Cannabis. Just wanted to provide an update on Cannabis Canopy because we learned that there had been a delay in the project timeline that required us to kind of recalibrate the timeline on this. So under the new timeline, we are hoping to bring our CR 102 to the Board around May 18th. That will allow enough time for stakeholder engagement, and we hope to start that in early April. And that gives me an opportunity to just speak briefly to what we are doing with regard to sort of retiring our old Listen and Learn model and recalibrating that as well and trying something new moving forward. So just wanted to remind folks, that is the direction we are going with our Listen and Learn model. Anyway, under that timeline. We could potentially have a public hearing in mid-July and then final adoption early August, with this effective date sometime in September. And again, these dates are tentative.

We are collaborating across the Agency to create guidance, or a policy statement or something similar to allay any concerns regarding the current growing season going into next year. So work continues on that, and Jeff will provide you with an update. Any questions on that before we move forward?

Chair Postman: Just a quick comment on the canopy timeline. And I know you know this, but that is an issue the Board has been focused on. And so at some point -- and I'm looking forward to what we are going to hear soon from Jeff -- but we will probably have to bring you guys back at some point between

now and late Spring and have a bigger conversation about all of that, you know, the timing and what you're thinking. Because I think all three Board Members have an interest in that.

Kathy Hoffman: Yeah. It's an interesting topic, and it's very important to our stakeholders.

Chair Postman: Yeah, yeah. And I guess that is why we heard about it like we did.

Kathy Hoffman: Yes, it is.

Chair Postman: And it is. And like I said, I'm looking forward to the conversation, but it's also just a fascinating kind of conundrum in a way.

Kathy Hoffman: It is, it is.

Chair Postman: So yeah. So we will find some time for a longer conversation, I think, when all Board Members are here to talk about that path that you were just laying down.

Kathy Hoffman: Sounds great.

Chair Postman: Good. Thank you.

Kathy Hoffman: Moving on to Cannabis Product Sampling, I hope to bring a CR 101 to the Board on March 1st. And that was the petition that the Board approved on August 31. So this is one of that collection of petitions that were received over the summer in high volume. I am going to start moving that forward, and then hopefully under that timeline we may have a CR 102 ready to go by mid-May, assuming there is enough time for stakeholder engagement within that timeframe, and then potentially a CR 103 by early August. Again, timelines are tentative given the amount of stakeholder engagement that is required for each project. And each project is different, I would say.

With respect to Cannabis Advertising, of course, Cassidy has taken that project over. She's getting ready to sort of reconvene the internal project workgroup. And under the timeline that she has revised, she hopes to bring a 102 to the Board in mid-July, so she is anticipating a great deal of stakeholder engagement there, and then a 103 by the end of October. So lots of work happening there. We are looking forward to moving that project forward. And then she's also going to be bringing the 101 to the Board concerning Minors under 16 on Production Premises and Minors Over 16 but Under 21 Assisting Contractors on those same Premises. So combining that into a single CR 101. And that, again, is part of that collection of rule petitions we received in July that the Board approved in late August. Her timeline for this is bringing the 101 to you late March. I think there is a lot of complexity with this particular issue. I think everyone is aware of some of the controversy around allowing minors on cannabis premises. But under that timeline, hoping to bring a 102 to you mid-August, and that would have final rules somewhere around the early part of November.

And then, finally, I want to talk briefly about the Cloud Storage Option Project. Of course, you approved the CR 101 at the last Board Meeting. Daniel shared the timeline, but just to reiterate, hoping to bring the CR 102 to you by mid-May with finalization sometime around mid-July. So that concludes this presentation and update. Any questions I can answer?

Chair Postman: Just one general question, concern, whatever. So we are talking about all these timelines, but we also have this legislative session that could dump a bunch more work on your team. Right?

Kathy Hoffman: That's right.

Chair Postman: Do you build that into your schedule?

Kathy Hoffman: Yes.

Chair Postman: Is that a possibility?

Kathy Hoffman: We do. And I think that is one of the things to really underscore that these timelines are tentative. And there could be legislation that says we have to have rules done by a date certain.

Chair Postman: Right.

Kathy Hoffman: We don't see legislation like that very often. But yeah, sometimes that happens. Other times we are able to, in some instances, withdraw a 101 because it is substantially similar to legislation that we might need to be implementing and then refile and combine so that we can sort of pull the work together moving forward. And then some projects, we just have to put on pause if we have got rules that we absolutely need to get moved forward immediately. And that was the case with 1480 the Temporary Alcohol Allowances, Audrey had to put a few things on hold to make sure that we implemented it timely.

Chair Postman: Yeah, but not just some that -- even two or three bills if we were to get those two bills, THC and Social Equity Law that would be a significant to-do list, right?

Kathy Hoffman: Right. Those would absolutely float to the top of our priority list. All right. Thanks very much. And I'm handing it over to Jeff.

Chair Postman: Great. Good morning.

Jeff Kildahl: Hey. Good morning, Chair Postman, and Board Member Garrett. In the late Summer of 2022, the Board approved a CR-101 Preproposal Statement of Inquiry to consider possible amendments to the rules establishing the cannabis canopy limits set by the tier system in WAC 314-55-075 and to also evaluate the current definition of "plant canopy" that is contained in the Agency's WAC. WAC 314-55-075 was adopted in 2013 with the implementation of Initiative 502, and it outlines the privileges, requirements, and fees for cannabis producer licensees, including guidelines for the maximum area that a producer licensee may dedicate to cannabis production. The area of the producer licensees premise dedicated to live plant production is recognized as plant canopy and includes the area dedicated to live plant production, including maintaining mother plants, propagating plants from seed to plant tissue, cloning, and vegetative and flowering growing areas.

Cannabis producers are limited by their license tier level in WAC 314-55-075 to the amount of square footage either indoor floor space, greenhouse space, or outdoor area that they can dedicate to cannabis plant production. And I'm guessing you are familiar with the tier system and the space requirements in the tier system. Cannabis producers utilize a wide range of techniques and configurations in plant cultivation and bring their cannabis harvests typically once or twice a year when producing outdoors or as often as five times per year in intensively managed indoor grows. Producer licensees sell harvested cannabis to

other producers. Or if the producer is also a licenser processor, they may process the cannabis into intermediate or end products for sale to licensed retail stores.

To better understand licensee and other stakeholder concerns related to measurement of plant canopy and the application of the current rule to develop themes that might inform rule development and to explore whether there might be broader policy considerations, the rules team enlisted two World Café virtual stakeholder sessions. In following the World Café model, we posed three questions in each World Café meeting. In the first World Café we asked, 1.) How should we treat floor space that is not in production? 2.) How could we update the tier system? 3.) And how should we measure canopy? And in the second World Café, we asked three different questions. 1.) Would producers benefit from more flexibility in how they use cannabis growing area? 2.) Should the tiered levels be modernized to follow maximum yield limits instead of a measured canopy area? 3.) Would following annual yield limits be a better way to regulate cannabis production?

In the World Café forums, the participants divided into small groups to consider these questions and then reconvened with the large group to harvest ideas gathered from the small group discussions. The results of the idea harvest are preserved in a thematic analysis document to memorialize the ideas recorded from the session transcripts. The thematic analysis I'm sharing with you today provides an overview of harvested ideas, what those ideas might imply for current rule, and potential conceptual rule revisions, options, or other solutions for consideration and discussion. So, several broad themes regarding cannabis canopy emerged and were discussed in the World Café sessions. While not all the participants contributed to all discussions, the participants expressed a consistent belief that floorspace not dedicated directly to plant production should not be counted in canopy measurements.

There was some desire to consider how cannabis grows could incorporate larger spatial footprints to grant the producer flexibility for larger indoor spaces or outdoor fallow fields that are cultivated with cover crops to improve the soil fertility. Participants roundly expressed the view that the rules regarding canopy are only as good as the enforcement, and consistent application of existing measurement protocols is necessary to make sure that any producers at or approaching the spatial limits of their tier levels do not exceed the tier limits. There were suggestions for measuring canopy including using drones with software to measure canopy area as is used in the various forestry applications or to use a volumetric measure to take into consideration not only the area but also the relative size of the cannabis plants. There was an idea to make sure that canopy measurements are simple and can be easily followed by both the licensee and the LCB team members. It was pointed out by one of the participants that all of the floor plans that are sent to Licensing and approved are in most cases produced by the licensee themselves.

There was an idea also to consider limiting production by allowing a predetermined plant count to have plant tags that are equipped with a Radio Frequency Identification Chip known as an RFID chip that could identify the plant and could produce a quick count of plants that are in a grill. Some other themes emerged around updating the tier system itself which considered changes to the tier levels. These conceptual revisions would require significant redesign of the existing tier system. Various ideas for distinguishing tiers with indoor and outdoor canopy limits, expanding canopy limits for certain producer types, and permitting producers to change tiers or go to a dormant tier level were ideas that were brought forth. Regarding the idea of limiting production by weight instead of the size of canopy was an idea that was endorsed by some participants. But many of the others also expressed concern that regulating production by yield would not help to balance out market oversupply and could actually stimulate overproduction or create an increased risk of product diversion, or it could harm growers who are otherwise following the letter of the regulation but are relief prolific or experiencing above average

harvest, it could potentially have them reach or exceed any kind of a weight limit that would be calibrated to their operation.

Along with the concerns about oversupply, another consideration was recognized in the World Café sessions. Cannabis producers recognize the possibility of federal cannabis rescheduling and the potential for new markets if interstate commerce and cannabis becomes possible as part of federal legalization. There was agreement in discussing this that we should be looking towards this federal legalization and that we should do what we can to allow the tier systems to ramp up so that producers will not be left behind the curve when and if the National Interstate Commerce occurs. And in that scenario, perhaps a yield limit could be a good possibility for regulating production in the industry. So in analyzing the ideas generated by these discussions, we are considering potential rule revisions or solutions, such as expanding and refining the current definition of canopy in WAC 314-55-010.

Other possible rule revisions regarding the extra space in licensed rural premises, possible revisions describing the difference between indoor, outdoor, and multi-level indoor growing, and possible rule changes addressing outdoor canopy measurement. And finally, the changes to the tier system itself, which we have mentioned, would invite consideration of some broader issues than just the issue of how to measure and limit production.

So this concludes my comments today, summarizing major themes in the sessions I sent out a copy of the thematic analysis to you earlier this morning so that you would have that available to you. And this concludes my comments, and I'm happy to answer any questions you have about canopy.

Chair Postman: Thank you. So I only briefly looked through the document. And it's hard in my first read to find anything that doesn't also have sort of a negative attached to it. Right? There is some talk about yield... but now these concerns, or weight...but then if you're fast freezing..., there is so much give and take on all of this. And I guess I say that only to say good luck. It's hard to figure out what that path is. I do think that one of the strong themes that comes through, as you've mentioned, is the interplay of possible federal legalization. And I would just say I don't know how much we should put that into our thinking. Obviously, we can all talk about it and figure it out, only because I just don't see it happening very soon. And I think we need a really workable understandable program here that can be enforced equitably across the state. I just don't want us to either wait or have too many sort of triggers. I mean, if legalization comes, we could have some trigger in there or something, but we are not ready. I'm not ready, one Board member, I'm not ready to dispose of a way to measure production and whether it's canopy or the same.

So anyhow, like I said, it's fascinating, but it's difficult to try to figure out what is the right way to do it. And for us at the LCB, right has to mean uniformly enforced. And maybe it's uniformly for outdoor and uniformly for indoor, but I have had licensees talk to me about double decker, growing indoors. What do you do then? Is that an unfair advantage? All of those things, so I don't know. It's interesting. I guess that is all I say is, good luck.

Jeff Kildahl: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Postman.

Chair Postman: Ollie, anything to add?

Ollie Garrett: No, you covered it. Good luck.

Chair Postman: What is the next step, Jeff? When will we see something next?

Jeff Kildahl: Well, we are reconvening the rule team to start working on possible changes and considering some rule language. So within the next couple of weeks that will be underway, and I'll provide updates along the way as we do that. If we go in the direction of having any rule amendments, then we will, of course, have the stakeholder work and stuff occurring too. So we will keep you in close contact about the progress here.

Chair Postman: Okay. And then the only thing I thought of is we did send a notice to licensees last year when we started this process sort of putting some things on hold. So I just wonder if there's anything we need to do between now and when people are growing again or something. If this delay needs us to restate current policy or whatever that would be, we should think about that, too, and make sure that people out there who are growing understand what the status quo is and how long that status quo is likely to stay in place. So, for future conversation.

Jeff Kildahl: Certainly, we will do that. Thank you.

AGENCY UPDATES

Rick Garza, Agency Director

Rick Garza: Good morning, Chair Postman, Board Member Garrett. I was out of the office last week on vacation, so I'm trying to catch up with email. I don't really have anything to report at this moment, but I know we will be meeting next week and, I'm available for any questions you might have.

Chair Postman: Yeah, well you're catching up, so we will give you time. Today, we are talking about all the things that are top of mind, social equity and canopy, in particular, and our Legislative Agenda. So, let us know anything we -- I just say let's err on the side of more conversations and more briefings like this today, and so just let us know if any of those things need our time, Rick, and we will make that happen.

Rick Garza: Yeah, I absolutely do want to commend Marc and the work that the staff and, in fact, our Board Members are involved in, many of the bills that we are involved in. And they seem to be moving forward, as Marc said. And we have got a long session, and I'm sure there will be more challenges and more issues. I know that DIA Maps created some concern, but I think staff, Ollie, Becky, and others were able to meet with members to help them understand the changes that can be made and need to be made in order to make sure that that works the way that we want it to work. So appreciate all the work of staff. And as Marc has shared, Chandra is testifying on a bill this afternoon. But I think we are about where we need to be. Marc suggested we haven't seen any hesitation to move our stuff forward. Maybe to better clarify. But it would be really interesting to see what happens.

Chair Postman, you shared the THC Bill. We had that whole dilemma when we brought the bill forward, as proposed legislation. Some saying it's too high, some saying it's too low, and here it is in front of us, again, with the same arguments. And so, hopefully, we will -- and you asked the right question. At some point, all those parties will need to come to some agreement in order to make that legislation before which of course, we hope does. And I think you're right, we are, we are right there in the middle of that of those who think it's too much or too little. So hopefully, that bill will move forward.

Chair Postman: Yeah.

Rick Garza: And that is all I'd have to share today. Thank you.

AGENCY UPDATES

Becky Smith, Licensing and Regulation Director

Kaitlin Bamba, Deputy Director of Operations

Becky Smith: Good morning. Chair Postman, and Board Member Garrett. I first want to start with thanking you for providing us some time on the caucus calendar to give you some updates on social equity. I do want to start with our webinars because they ended last week. This weekend, we had our last webinar on Saturday evening. And I will tell you about 800 people viewed the link, and about 500 people registered, and they had some really good conversations. A number of people watched the whole video that interacted with our staff and our vendors. And that really means that the video wasn't too long. So the training wasn't too long, which is also a really good indicator. We also could see that people are clicking onto the links. And again that also really will help them in going through the application process in March.

And then right away as we were providing training, we were able to have folks give us a score on how they thought the training went, and mostly 4 out of 5 or 5 out of 5. Again, it is good feedback to receive. The feedback was mostly positive, so I think we are in a good place with the application process and training folks. And people have about a month to start to collect the documents that they were going to need in order to apply on March 1st. So I just wanted to share that first. And then I also want to give an update about our DIA Maps. As you know, we released our DIA Maps about two to three weeks ago. Right away, we heard from community who had some concerns that the map was -- that it was to take a look at the community members who were most likely impacted by the war on drugs. And that was at 20%. So when we were looking at the DIAs and the census tracts, we looked at what was in the top 20%. So 20% of high poverty rate, 20% of the rate of participation in income-based federal programs, 20% rate of unemployment, and 20% of the high rate of conviction. And so, that is how we mapped the first time.

But with all the feedback we received, there wasn't much that we could change, but we could change the percentage. So we can change any of the four indicators. I want to make that clear that was required by legislation, and RCW 69.50.335 requires that we use those indicators, but we could change the percentage. So at 30%, it's still considered to be a high rate. And so we worked with our vendor and with our maps in order to take a look at those changes and see what that would do as far as including more areas that were mostly impacted by the war on drugs. And so I asked Kaitlin to join me this morning to share the maps. And we were hoping to see the maps be able to be uploaded by the end of the week. Again, we want to make sure that everything is correct before we update the maps, and so this is a preliminary view of the map. Kaitlin?

Chair Postman: Can I just ask one clarifying question before you do that, Kaitlin? I think I got this, but I just want to make sure it's clear. So when we talked about changing from 20% to 30%, when we started this, what we said was the ones that qualify as a DIA are really the highest poverty rates, you know, it's the top 20% of the -- I mean, it's weird to say highest poverty, but you know what I mean -- the lowest income areas, where the most economically-distressed area is. And now what we are doing is we are growing that from 20% to 30% to capture areas that are theoretically less economically distressed than our first batch but expands that into other areas that are distressed income areas. Do I have it right?

Becky Smith: You have that.

Chair Postman: Okay. Thank you. And, you know, I just can't stop editing, Becky, and I apologize for that. But on our website, where you go to the DIA Map, we should just put a little paragraph there that says what these are based on. Like these maps show this, and it's the top 30% of these.

Becky Smith: We can do that.

Chair Postman: Sorry to edit online here, but I was just going to the map as we were talking, and I was looking at it this morning. And it's like, let's just define what that is there. So anyhow, sorry, to interrupt.

Becky Smith: And we are hoping to have a different look at the maps. And you know everybody keeps talking about this flat map, so we are going to see about being able to provide a flat map.

Chair Postman: What's that?

Becky Smith: And that is what you are seeing here. So not putting any addresses in, not putting your address in but being able just to take a look to see what qualifies. And then you'll have to put your address in, as well, because it won't be good enough just to look at the map. We want to be able to provide that view. It's something that we did get feedback from Senator Saldaña and others that they would like to see this map just viewed in a couple of different ways. So we are able to accomplish that and, again, looking at doing that by the end of the week.

Chair Postman: Great. Great. Okay. Go ahead.

Kaitlin Bamba: Hopefully, you all can see my screen here.

Chair Postman: Yes.

Kaitlin Bamba: Okay. So this map, as Becky mentioned, represents the entire state. And so what I have here is in the reddish-purple, I would say, those are in the top 20%, and then the blue would be those that would be in the top 30%. So the blue are the new areas being added on. And the map, I can display the information. So this is what it looks like as a state for the 1980s, and then I'm just going to go through and add on the 1990s. And you can see more areas will pop up on the screen. And then we can go 2000 and see where 2010 adds in.

Chair Postman: Hmm.

Kaitlin Bamba: And then I can zone in so you can see a little bit better. Let's zone in to like Seattle/Tacoma area. We can look here for 1980 what it looks like, 1990, 2000, and then 2010.

Chair Postman: Do you know on a -- why don't we do it as a census tract or whatever -- how many places are being added by going from 20 to 30 if you can do it by census tract? Do we know that? Like before it was this many thousand, and now it's this many thousands or hundreds.

Katlin Bamba: Yes. So, across the state for the 80s, there was for top 20 the 72 tracks, but in the top 30, it's 134.

Chair Postman: Wow. Okay. So it's a significant change.

Katlin Bamba: It is.

Chair Postman: It also seems to me that we, as time moves on, have more areas of economically distressed places in our state, just as a side note. And when you go from 20 to 30, have you had a chance to look, does that get spread around fairly evenly geographically? So it just sort of goes with the --

Katlin Bamba: Yes. You'll see the bigger census tracts. Census tracts are based off population. So those look really big, but the population is much smaller in those areas.

Chair Postman: I see. Okay. Yeah. Interesting. And the bulk of the number of people, obviously, would be on the west side in the urban areas because those census tracts are going to just have a lot more people living in them. Is that a fair assumption?

Katlin Bamba: On the west side?

Chair Postman: The number of people who would be eligible based on this map, just as everything in the state, more is on the west, so there is going to be more people in the urban areas, the denser populated areas that might qualify as living in a DIA, even though the numbers -- Becky, go ahead.

Becky Smith: So not necessarily so.

Chair Postman: Okay.

Becky Smith: So remember our rural communities are the ones that you'll see that really did hit all of the top four indicators. So when it comes to poverty, when it comes to unemployment, those you will see in our reservations, for instance, in the tribal areas. You will also see that in the Grays Harbor County, again, so not necessarily in our urban areas.

Chair Postman: Okay.

Becky Smith: We did see an increase in our urban areas, though, so Pierce County, Tacoma, Renton, for instance --

Chair Postman: South Seattle.

Becky Smith: -- south Seattle but certainly not as large as we are seeing in some of our rural areas.

Chair Postman: I see. Okay. Good to know. Thank you.

Becky Smith: And those are all of our updates we have unless you have more questions, Board Member Garrett.

Ollie Garrett: Do you think -- and I don't know if we can get it scheduled with, was it Dr. William yesterday?

Becky Smith: Yes.

Ollie Garrett: Yes. With Dr. William, it will benefit having him explain because his portion wasn't long, to maybe at an EMT so that all of the directors get it. Because I was listening to the questions that David was asking, and maybe him explaining all of this to everyone because everybody is going to be approached by somebody as to how we came to this, so they can fully understand what he did. I don't

know what his availability is like, but is this something that -- and, David, if that is what you want -- can come to an EMT or something?

Chair Postman: Or a Caucus? Yeah, I think --

Ollie Garrett: Or a Caucus, whatever we tell her.

Chair Postman: One of your updates, Becky, we could have him join you if that is -- we can talk about that and see. Are we going to still go ahead and for the census tracts show the four different factors for each? Is that going to be available?

Becky Smith: I believe he's working on that as well.

Chair Postman: Okay. Okay. I think that will help a lot, too.

Becky Smith: Okay.

Chair Postman: But I think we should definitely think about that, too. And, Becky, we will rely on you to let us know. But, again, we are ready and available for any kind of conversation about that to help spread the word on this.

Becky Smith: That is great. And we will see something coming out from Communications, as well, on our DIA Maps again later on this week when the maps are ready to be rolled out. And so we want people to hear about it. We want folks to know to go back and take another look at the DIA Maps to make sure if they didn't qualify before, they might qualify now. Certainly, no guarantees, but we want them to take another look at the map.

Chair Postman: Yeah, great. Yeah. We all need to just get that word out as much as you can, so appreciate that. Thank you both. Ollie, Go ahead.

Ollie Garrett: Becky, on the training video that you did last week, is that it? Are there going to be any others?

Becky Smith: That's it. Folks who are interested in going back and viewing the training, they will be able to continue to do that.

Ollie Garrett: Okay, so they can always go back and view it.

Becky Smith: Yes, absolutely.

Chair Postman: And they can always submit questions. Right?

Becky Smith: Yes, always can submit questions. And we will answer them back or even have other folks respond to them, as well. If they have questions about does this document meet the requirements, we can certainly have the third party vendor start to answer those questions.

Ollie Garrett: Okay. And you do have an article in the Seattle Medium this week. It was delivered yesterday, so I saw it coming from the show you did last week.

Becky Smith: Well, hopefully, that was worked out well.

Chair Postman: I'm sure it did. Okay. Again, I appreciate the presentation today but really the work that has gone on every day since you guys started this, but just in the last week or so I think Licensing has just once again gone above and beyond to try to listen to people, talk to legislators, Board Members, and others to figure out what the best path forward is. And it just shows that you are problem solvers, and the Board really appreciates that. So thank you, both and thank your team for us on that work.

Becky Smith: We will definitely do that. And thank you. Thank you for all your support. Have a good afternoon.

Chair Postman: You too. Thank you, both.

BOARD MEMBER AND EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT REPORTS

No reports.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 am.

Minutes approved this 15th day of January 2025



Jim Vollendroff
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett
Board Member

Minutes Prepared by: Deborah Soper, Administrative Assistant to the Board

Complete meeting packets are available online: http://lcb.wa.gov/boardmeetings/board_meetings For questions about agendas or meeting materials you may email gretchen.frost@lcb.wa.gov or call 360.664.1656

LCB Mission - Promote public safety, public health, and trust through fair administration, education, and enforcement of liquor, cannabis, tobacco, and vapor laws.